



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,587	03/29/2001	Darin Wayne Higgins	108344.00020	3453

22852 7590 07/11/2003

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

WANG, JIN CHENG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

9

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/821,587

Applicant(s)

HIGGINS ET AL.

27

Examiner

Jin-Cheng Wang

Art Unit

2672

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 March 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

1) The applicant argues in essence with respect to the amended claim 1 and similar claims that Tamano does not teach or suggest at least the step of displaying a first map in one area of a display wherein the first map is a vector map. In response, the examiner asserts that Tamano DOES teach the step of displaying a first map wherein the first map is a vector.

In column 6, lines 32-67 of Tamano, it is stated "The choice of object that thereby causes the image information to correspond thereto (Step 210) will be described below with reference to FIG. 8. An object in the displayed second image information 2 is chosen by the input device 10 in accordance with the program 19 (Step 2100). For example, as shown in FIG. 10(a), a cursor 103 is moved onto an object to be chosen, and an instruction to choose the object is input. The cursor 103 for choosing the object may be manipulated by amouse or a pen input device, or may also be chosen by moving a finger or hand on a touch panel attached to the display screen. Then, it is determined whether a correspondence relative to the object input in Step 2100 is already present in the file 6 (Step 2110). If no correspondence is present, a correspondence is stored (Step 240). If there is a correspondence, this correspondence is displayed in accordance with the program 17 (Step 2130). FIG. 10(c) shows one example of a screen on which the correspondence is displayed. On method of displaying the correspondence is to display a part 105 in the first image information 1 that corresponds to a chosen object 104 in the second image information 2, in a manner different from the manner in which the other parts are displayed. Such different displays can be realized by varying the luminance, color, shape, pattern or line thickness of the part 105 or by blinking the display of the part 105."

In column 4, lines 26-53 of Tamano, it is stated "A residence map is one example of the first image information 1...As one example of the second image information 2, a road map which describes the status of roads is employed."

The examiner asserts that the second image information 2 such as a road map of Tamano could be a vector map. Support for a road map being a vector map can be found in the newly cited reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,305 to Kambe).

Therefore, putting the new limitation of "the first map being a vector map" does not overcome the reference cited in the FINAL REJECTION NOR does it render the amended claim 1 (AFTER FINAL) allowable because Tamano teaches all the elements of the amended claim 1 as currently drafted.

2) Applicant argues in essence with respect to the amended claim 1 and similar claims that Tamano does not teach, disclose or suggest the step of displaying a first map in one area of a display wherein the first map is a vector map, and in fact, it specifically teaches away from this feature. In response, the examiner asserts that Tamano teaches the step of displaying a first map in one area of a display wherein the first map is a vector map (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,305 teaches the fact that a road map is a vector map). Tamano further teaches an image map instead of a vector map and therefore the first image map information 1 is simply an image map instead of a vector map in certain implementation of Tamano instead of the prior art's teaching that the first image map information 1 is a vector map (this reinforces the fact that other prior art teaches as well the claim limitation) because the second image map information 2 is a vector map. Therefore, Tamano does not teach away from this feature.

In summary Tamano teaches all the limitations of the amended claim 1 and similar claims as currently drafted.



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600